

## Persuasive Letter Grades 9-12 Skills List

The writer of a competent letter demonstrates most or all of the following skills:

### **PURPOSE/AUDIENCE**

- shows an understanding of the reader's perspective
- writes from the perspective of an informed writer to a less-informed reader
- meets the reader's needs by adhering to the conventions of a letter
- focuses on the purpose
- narrows topic
- writes to a reader other than the teacher
- anticipates reader's reactions, questions, lack of understanding, point of view
- writes a beginning which gives the reader some context or reason for reading the letter
- makes it clear what the reader should know, do, and/or believe as a result of reading the letter
- uses an individual voice and/or appropriate tone

### **IDEA DEVELOPMENT/SUPPORT**

- develops ideas which are connected to the core content of the course in which the letter was written
- uses appropriate strategies to develop ideas
- uses information from a variety of sources
- supports ideas with facts and opinions; demonstrates knowledge of the difference between fact and opinion
- shows evidence of logical reasoning
- uses persuasive techniques
- provides support which is accurate and thorough enough to achieve the purpose of the piece

### **ORGANIZATION**

- writes an engaging lead
- places ideas and details in meaningful order
- organizes the letter into paragraphs
- uses transitions between ideas
- maintains coherence and unity
- concludes the letter effectively

### **SENTENCES**

- writes complete and varied sentences

### **LANGUAGE**

- chooses language appropriate to the audience and purpose
- uses specific, concise language
- maintains consistent verb tense
- makes subjects and verbs agree
- employs correct usage

### **CORRECTNESS**

- uses correct letter format
- spells correctly
- uses correct end punctuation, commas, quotation marks, apostrophes
- capitalizes correctly
- makes few errors in correctness which do not interfere with the meaning of the piece

As students move from grade to grade, they demonstrate growth in the control and complexity with which they use these skills.

The Kentucky Marker Papers  
Committee did not find a sample  
to fit the category

Ninth-grade Persuasive Letter

Submissions may still be sent to

Lee Ann Hager  
500 Mero Street, CPT 1913  
Frankfort, KY 40601

Phone: (502) 564-2106  
Fax: (502) 564-6470

The Kentucky Marker Papers  
Committee did not find a sample  
to fit the category

Tenth-grade Persuasive Letter

Submissions may still be sent to

Lee Ann Hager  
500 Mero Street, CPT 1913  
Frankfort, KY 40601

Phone: (502) 564-2106  
Fax: (502) 564-6470

September 29, 1999

"Your View"

Neighborhoods

The Courier Journal

525 W. Broadway

PO Box 740031

Louisville, KY 40201-7431

Dear Editor

The compact disc now represents 65% of all albums sold in the world. In the United States, over \$13 billion worth of CDs have been sold. Many people buy CDs, especially teen-agers. Many of the CDs that are available to buy contain songs with explicit lyrics. Should measures be taken to control the production and distribution of these CDs, or should purchases be left to consumer discretion?

Many groups are lobbying to make record companies label all sound recordings that contain offensive lyrics. Some groups even go so far as to try and restrict the sales of CDs with explicit lyrics to individuals 18 years of age and older. We live in a democratic society where individuals should be free to listen to whatever they choose. By restricting the sales of offensive CDs, people are attempting to take away our 1<sup>st</sup> amendment rights. Individuals should be able to listen to any type of music they wish, regardless of their age.

Artists should be able to express themselves freely and in any manner they choose. They shouldn't have to worry about groups trying to get the songs censored. Wal-Mart has, for some time now, been pressuring record companies to send them "cleansed" versions of records if they want them to be sold in the store. A lot of companies have caved in, considering that Wal-Mart is the leading seller of music in the country, selling 8% of all CDs.

The purpose of music is to be enjoyed, not censored. Most record companies that create their own "cleansed" versions leave no sound at all where an offensive word would be. This makes for very difficult listening, especially in rap songs. It's like using scissors or black markers on offensive words in library books.

Whose responsibility is it to worry about what children are listening to? Many people will argue that it's the parents' responsibility to censor what their children are listening to. Many kids, though, pick up on the same language and behavior at home from their parents. Kids also pick up on it from their peers; it's not the records that are causing this language and behavior.

Other people will argue that it's the stores' responsibility not to sell CDs to children marked with explicit lyric labels. They can't do this, though, because

they operate under a commercial imperative to sell music. Store owners and companies would be barraged with lawsuits if they didn't sell to everyone.

Granted, many rap recordings are explicitly sexual and refer to women in degrading terms, but outlawing misogynous lyrics in music won't make misogyny in society disappear. An explanation for this is that rap music comes from a culture entirely different from our own, and differences can lead to negative feelings.

Recordings should be labeled so that consumers are provided with enough knowledge to help them make educated decisions. Those decisions, however, should be their own to make. Recordings should not be censored, either. If a person wants to buy the recording, then they will want to hear it the way it's supposed to sound, not with blanks throughout it. People have to learn that this type of music is part of our culture, whether they like it or not, and that many people like this type of music.

Sincerely,

R. \_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_

R. \_\_\_\_\_ S. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ S. \_\_\_\_\_ Dr.

\_\_\_\_\_ KY 4 \_\_\_\_\_

September 29, 1999

"Your View"  
Neighborhoods  
The Courier Journal  
525 W. Broadway  
PO Box 740031  
Louisville, KY 40201-7431

meets reader's  
needs by adhering  
to the conventions  
of a letter

Dear Editor

provides an  
engaging lead      narrows  
topic

The compact disc now represents 65% of all albums sold in the world. In the United States, over \$13 billion worth of CDs have been sold. Many people buy CDs, especially teen-agers. Many of the CDs that are available to buy contain songs with explicit lyrics. Should measures be taken to control the production and distribution of these CDs, or should purchases be left to consumer discretion?

shows  
understanding  
of a  
reader's  
perspective

Many groups are lobbying to make record companies label all sound recordings that contain offensive lyrics. Some groups even go so far as to try and restrict the sales of CDs with explicit lyrics to individuals 18 years of age and older. We live in a democratic society where individuals should be free to listen to whatever they choose. By restricting the sales of offensive CDs, people are attempting to take away our 1<sup>st</sup> amendment rights. Individuals should be able to listen to any type of music they wish, regardless of their age.

writes from  
the perspective  
of an informed  
writer to a  
less informed  
reader

Artists should be able to express themselves freely and in any manner they choose. They shouldn't have to worry about groups trying to get the songs censored. Wal-Mart has, for some time now, been pressuring record companies to send them "cleansed" versions of records if they want them to be sold in the store. A lot of companies have caved in, considering that Wal-Mart is the leading seller of music in the country, selling 8% of all CDs.

The purpose of music is to be enjoyed, not censored. Most record companies that create their own "cleansed" versions leave no sound at all where an offensive word would be. This makes for very difficult listening, especially in rap songs. It's like using scissors or black markers on offensive words in library books.

evidence of  
logical  
reasoning  
anticipates  
reader's  
reactions,  
questions,  
etc.

Whose responsibility is it to worry about what children are listening to? Many people will argue that it's the parents' responsibility to censor what their children are listening to. Many kids, though, pick up on the same language and behavior at home from their parents. Kids also pick up on it from their peers; it's not the records that are causing this language and behavior.

Other people will argue that it's the stores' responsibility not to sell CDs to children marked with explicit lyric labels. They can't do this, though, because

sentences are  
complete and  
varied

they operate under a commercial imperative to sell music. Store owners and companies would be barraged with lawsuits if they didn't sell to everyone.

Granted, many rap recordings are explicitly sexual and refer to women in degrading terms, but outlawing misogynous lyrics in music won't make misogyny in society disappear. An explanation for this is that rap music comes from a culture entirely different from our own, and differences can lead to negative feelings.

Recordings should be labeled so that consumers are provided with enough knowledge to help them make educated decisions. Those decisions, however, should be their own to make. Recordings should not be censored, either. If a person wants to buy the recording, then they will want to hear it the way it's supposed to sound, not with blanks throughout it. People have to learn that this type of music is part of our culture, whether they like it or not, and that many people like this type of music.

Sincerely,

R. S. \_\_\_\_\_  
R. S. \_\_\_\_\_ : Dr.  
\_\_\_\_\_. KY 4 \_\_\_\_\_

#### Next Lessons

- \* using information from a variety of sources
- \* using appropriate strategies to develop ideas for a more complex argument

uses transition between ideas

maintains coherence/unity

example of specific language

few errors in correctness

makes clear what the reader should do

Dear Editor,

In the article entitled "An Erratic Manning Puts the Giants on Blue Alert," in the *New York Times* on Sunday, November 26, 2006, columnist John Branch writes using a lopsided, biased opinion of New York Giants quarterback Eli Manning. Branch's side of the fence on this issue is becoming more and more popular to jump to, which makes quarterbacks more likely to be wrongfully faulted for a team's difficulties.

Branch links Manning's play to many choices the Giants' front office will soon have to face. Those decisions include, "Whether to extend (Giants Head Coach Tom) Coughlin's contract beyond the 2007 season; whether Coughlin shuffles any assistant coaches this off-season, particularly the offensive coordinator John Hufnagel, and the quarterbacks coach Kevin Gilbride." Branch is right in a sense. It will be Manning's play that makes these determinations—it just shouldn't be this way. Eli Manning isn't to blame for the struggles of this team; there are plenty of other reasons—mainly the other twenty-one players on the field along with the coaches.

Ask any coach in the NFL, and almost all of them will say they would rather have a tremendous defense—rather than an outstanding quarterback. Look at the Chicago Bears; they have a quarterback in Rex Grossman, who plays great some weeks, then other weeks has a 1.3 passer rating. They're still 10-2 and have already clinched their division crown. Their defense is winning the games. The quarterback position is, by-far, the most overrated position in the NFL. Keeping a team off the scoreboard is much more important than putting points on the scoreboard. The Giants are very suspect when it comes to the defensive side of the ball.

Don't believe me? Just look at the last two losses for the Giants. First, there's the monumental set-back suffered last week against the Dallas Cowboys. On the first play from scrimmage in the Cowboys' final, game-winning drive, the defense allowed Tony Romo to roll out and throw, on the run, to tight end Jason Witten—for 42 yards. There is no good explanation for defensive coordinator Steve Spagnuolo's decision to—instead of playing a prevent defense and disallow a deep throw—blitz Romo, giving up the big play. But we like blaming Eli Manning, right? Too bad he doesn't play defense. And he had a perfect day throwing the ball, going 24-36 for 270 yards and two touchdowns. But it's gotta be his fault, the quarterback's always the problem, right? Don't disregard those 24 unanswered points the Giants gave up in the final 12:55 against the Tennessee Titans when the Giants were spotted 21 points to start the fourth quarter.

Branch clearly articulates that changes within the coaching staff are imminent. However, Branch is wrong in putting forth these adjustments being dependent on Manning's play. On their second to last drive in the Giants' loss to the Cowboys, the Giants offense drove down the field and had a first and goal from the Dallas eight yard line. Their first play was a Brandon Jacobs run for four yards. Mind boggling that—instead of running the ball two more times for a touchdown to ice the game—offensive coordinator John Hufnagel decided to throw the ball twice and come away with nothing. Immediately following this baffling execution of victory, the boo birds in New York—including Branch—were out



to get Manning and stamp the word 'scapegoat' on his chest. Manning didn't make the decision to throw the ball when the team was close enough to the stands to smell the fan's beer breath—Hufnagel did. So why do fans and media alike insist on blaming Manning?

An old cliché in sports goes, "Players win games and coaches lose them." Not when it comes to New York Giants football—everybody else wins games, Eli Manning loses them. The Giants defense has allowed an impressive 12.7 ppg in the wins they've had this season, compared to a dismal 29.1 ppg in their losses.

This team's problems are not solved by plastering Manning with every dilemma they face. Branch is right, coaching staff changes need to be made, but it's their own fault, not Manning's. When—more like if—the New York media stops using Manning as the piñata of the New York Giants organization, people will understand that the quarterback isn't always the source of a team's problems.

(student name)

Dear Editor,

*writes to a reader  
other than a teacher*

In the article entitled "An Erratic Manning Puts the Giants on Blue Alert," in the *New York Times* on Sunday, November 26, 2006, columnist John Branch writes using a lopsided, biased opinion of New York Giants quarterback Eli Manning. Branch's side of the fence on this issue is becoming more and more popular to jump to, which makes quarterbacks more likely to be wrongfully faulted for a team's difficulties.

*writes with  
a beginning  
that gives  
a reader  
context or  
reason for  
reading*

Branch links Manning's play to many choices the Giants' front office will soon have to face. Those decisions include, "Whether to extend (Giants Head Coach Tom) Coughlin's contract beyond the 2007 season; whether Coughlin shuffles any assistant coaches this off-season, particularly the offensive coordinator John Hufnagel, and the quarterbacks coach Kevin Gilbride." Branch is right in a sense. It will be Manning's play that makes these determinations—it just shouldn't be this way. Eli Manning isn't to blame for the struggles of this team; there are plenty of other reasons—mainly the other twenty-one players on the field along with the coaches.

*shows voice  
appropriate  
tone*

Ask any coach in the NFL, and almost all of them will say they would rather have a tremendous defense—rather than an outstanding quarterback. Look at the Chicago Bears; they have a quarterback in Rex Grossman, who plays great some weeks, then other weeks has a 1.3 passer rating. They're still 10-2 and have already clinched their division crown. Their defense is winning the games. The quarterback position is, by-far, the most overrated position in the NFL. Keeping a team off the scoreboard is much more important than putting points on the scoreboard. The Giants are very suspect when it comes to the defensive side of the ball.

*uses  
appropriate  
strategies  
to develop  
ideas (e.g. use  
of examples  
and statistics)*

Don't believe me? Just look at the last two losses for the Giants. First, there's the monumental set-back suffered last week against the Dallas Cowboys. On the first play from scrimmage in the Cowboys' final, game-winning drive, the defense allowed Tony Romo to roll out and throw, on the run, to tight end Jason Witten—for 42 yards. There is no good explanation for defensive coordinator Steve Spagnuolo's decision to—instead of playing a prevent defense and disallow a deep throw—blitz Romo, giving up the big play. But we like blaming Eli Manning, right? Too bad he doesn't play defense. And he had a perfect day throwing the ball, going 24-36 for 270 yards and two touchdowns. But it's gotta be his fault, the quarterback's always the problem, right? Don't disregard those 24 unanswered points the Giants gave up in the final 12:55 against the Tennessee Titans when the Giants were spotted 21 points to start the fourth quarter.

*example of  
specific language**evidence of  
voice; effective  
language**supports ideas  
with facts  
and opinions**precise language*

Branch clearly articulates that changes within the coaching staff are imminent. However, Branch is wrong in putting forth these adjustments being dependent on Manning's play. On their second to last drive in the Giants' loss to the Cowboys, the Giants offense drove down the field and had a first and goal from the Dallas eight yard line. Their first play was a Brandon Jacobs run for four yards. Mind boggling that—instead of running the ball two more times for a touchdown to ice the game—offensive coordinator John Hufnagel decided to throw the ball twice and come away with nothing. Immediately following this baffling execution of victory, the boo birds in New York—including Branch—were out

*language  
is appropriate  
to audience  
and purpose**evidence of  
writer's  
voice*

to get Manning and stamp the word 'scapegoat' on his chest. Manning didn't make the decision to throw the ball when the team was close enough to the stands to smell the fan's beer breath—Hufnagel did. So why do fans and media alike insist on blaming Manning?

use of rhetorical question as a persuasive technique

writes in a variety of sentence structures

An old cliché in sports goes, "Players win games and coaches lose them." Not when it comes to New York Giants football—everybody else wins games, Eli Manning loses them. The Giants defense has allowed an impressive 12.7 ppg in the wins they've had this season, compared to a dismal 29.1 ppg in their losses.

shows evidence of logical reasoning

makes it clear what the reader should

know/do (student name) as a result of reading

This team's problems are not solved by plastering Manning with every dilemma they face. Branch is right, coaching staff changes need to be made, but it's their own fault, not Manning's. When—more like if—the New York media stops using Manning as the piñata of the New York Giants organization, people will understand that the quarterback isn't always the source of a team's problems.

meets the reader's needs by adhering to the conventions of a letter

Few errors in correctness